arXiv:quant-ph/9810074v2 26 Feb 1999

Insufficient reason and entropy in quantum theory

Ariel Caticha
Department of Physics, University at Albany-SUNY, Albany, NY 12222

Abstract

The objective of the consistent-amplitude approach to quantum theory has been to justify the mathematical formalism on the basis of three main assumptions: the first defines the subject matter, the second introduces amplitudes as the tools for quantitative reasoning, and the third is an interpretative rule that provides the link to the prediction of experimental outcomes. In this work we introduce a natural and compelling fourth assumption: if there is no reason to prefer one region of the configuration space over another then they should be 'weighted' equally. This is the last ingredient necessary to introduce a unique inner product in the linear space of wave functions. Thus, a form of the principle of insufficient reason is implicit in the Hilbert inner product. Armed with the inner product we obtain two results. First, we elaborate on an earlier proof of the Born probability rule. The implicit appeal to insufficient reason shows that quantum probabilities are not more objective than classical probabilities. Previously we had argued that the consistent manipulation of amplitudes leads to a linear time evolution; our second result is that time evolution must also be unitary. The argument is straightforward and hinges on the conservation of entropy. The only subtlety consists of defining the correct entropy; it is the *array* entropy, not von Neumann's. After unitary evolution has been established we proceed to introduce the useful notion of observables and we explore how von Neumann's entropy can be linked to Shannon's information theory. Finally, we discuss how various connections among the postulates of quantum theory are made explicit within this approach.

1 Introduction

Quantum theory is a set of rules for reasoning in situations where even under optimal conditions the information available to predict the outcome of an experiment may still turn out to be insufficient. This explains why the notion of probability plays such a central role and immediately raises a number of interesting questions.

One such question is whether these quantum probabilities differ in any essential way from ordinary classical probabilities. It is sometimes argued that

there is an element of subjectivity in the nature of classical probabilities that is not shared by quantum probabilities, that the latter are totally objective because they are given by the Born rule, that is, by the modulus squared of the wave function. One of the purposes of this paper is to support the opposite point of view: we will argue that the probabilities assigned using the Born rule are neither more nor less subjective than say, the probability 1/6 assigned to each face of a die when there is no reason to favor one face over another. We will show that there is a form of the principle of insufficient reason implicitly encoded into the usual postulates of quantum theory.

A second question is the following. One would expect that if predictions are to be made on the basis of insufficient information then quantities that measure the amount of information, entropies, should play a central role [1][2][3]. Remarkably, one finds that while the notion of entropy is indeed extremely useful, its use in foundational issues has been very limited [4][5][6]. Entropy is not mentioned in the postulates; it is introduced later either to analyze quantum measurements or in statistical mechanics where problems are sufficiently complicated that clean deductive methods fail and one is forced to use dirtier inference methods. A second purpose of this paper is to show that entropic arguments are, in fact, implicit in the usual quantum postulates.

This paper is a continuation of previous work [7][8] in which quantum theory is formulated as the only consistent way to manipulate amplitudes. In this consistent-amplitude quantum theory (CAQT) amplitudes have a clear interpretation: they are tools for reasoning that encode information about how complicated experimental setups are related to those more elementary setups from which they were built. The result of this approach is the standard quantum theory [9][4], in a form that is very close to Feynman's [10].

The objective of CAQT has been to justify the mathematical formalism on the basis of rather general assumptions in the hope that this would not only clarify the formal connections among the various postulates of quantum theory but also illuminate the issue of how the formalism should be interpreted. In this respect the traditional approach has been to set up the formalism first and then try to find out what it all means. This problem of attributing physical meaning to mathematical constructs is a notoriously difficult one. So, instead of taking the standard quantum theory as axiomatized by, say, von Neumann, and then, appending an interpretation to it, the approach we take is to build the formalism and its interpretation simultaneously.

In the brief summary of the CAQT given in section 2 three of the main assumptions are explicitly stated. The first concerns the subject matter: quantum theory is concerned with predicting the outcomes of experiments performed with certain setups. The second introduces amplitudes as the tools for quantitative reasoning, and the third is an interpretative rule that provides the link between the mathematical formalism and the actual prediction of experimental outcomes.

It is quite remarkable that although the interpretative rule does not in itself

involve probabilities it can be used to prove the Born statistical 'postulate' (or, better, the Born 'rule') [12] provided one extra ingredient is added. The need for this fourth assumption arises because the application of the interpretative rule requires a criterion to quantify the change in amplitudes when setups are modified. In [8] the criterion adopted was to use the Hilbert norm as the means to measure the distance between wave functions. Such a technical assumption without any obvious physical basis clearly detracts from the beauty and cogency of the argument. In section 3 this blemish is corrected; we do not remove the assumption, we just rewrite it in a form that is physically more appealing and suggestive [13]. The main point is that the components out of which setups are built, the filters, already supply us with a notion of orthogonality and this takes us a long way towards defining an inner product. Thus, instead of a strong and unnatural assumption about the Hilbert norm we make a much weaker and more natural assumption about the inner product.

The fourth assumption takes the form of a symmetry argument: if there is no reason to prefer one region of the configuration space over another then they should be weighted equally. The mere fact that some such assumption is necessary already has interesting implications. The fact that a form of the principle of insufficient reason is implicit in the Hilbert inner product brings quantum probabilities closer to their classical counterparts. Quantum probabilities are not more objective than classical probabilities. The interpretation of quantum mechanics, just like that of other theories of inference, is affected by the issue of what probabilities mean.

Once one finds that time evolution must be linear [7] the obvious next question is whether it must also be unitary. These two issues of linearity and unitarity are usually considered together (for a short review see *e.g.* [14]). A common explanation for the unitarity of time evolution is that it guarantees the conservation of probabilities. This is true but it is also irrelevant; that probabilities should add up to one is true by definition [15], and any non-conservation of probabilities can always be trivially fixed by reinterpreting $|\Psi|^2$ as a relative probability rather than the probability itself.

Another common explanation based on Wigner's theorem [16] is also found to be inadequate. The idea is to start with a quantum kinematics given by a Hilbert space and deduce linear and unitary evolution from the assumption that time evolution is a 'symmetry' by which it is meant a transformation that preserves orthogonality among states. The question, of course, is why should time evolution be a 'symmetry' in this technical sense. In fact, when the assumption is relaxed one finds, as expected, that the corresponding dynamics is non-unitary and irreversible [17].

This suggests yet another approach. It is a matter of definition that entropy, as a measure of amount of information, is conserved whenever the information available for the prediction of experimental outcomes is not spoiled by the mere passage of time. The plan, then, is simple: impose entropy conservation and

from this deduce unitary time evolution. There is, however, one remaining obstacle: one must identify the correct entropy. The obvious candidate, von Neumann's entropy, fails. The problem is that the interpretation, the very meaning of von Neumann's entropy, is derived in the context of a linear quantum theory that is already assumed to be unitary [4]. Therefore, arguments based on von Neumann's entropy are circular.

The argument we offer in section 4 is based on the idea of array entropy, a concept that was briefly introduced by Jaynes [18] only to be dismissed as an inadequate candidate for the entropy of a quantum system, a quantity which he identified with von Neumann's entropy. From the point of view of the CAQT, however, amplitudes and wave functions are assigned not just to the system but to the whole experimental setup, and this turns the array entropy into a legitimate entropy for our purpose. Its conservation implies the conservation of the Hilbert norm and unitary evolution. As claimed above, the notion of entropy plays an important role at the foundations of quantum theory; it is implicit in the postulate that time evolution is unitary.

Up to this point the discussion has been about experiments involving idealized detectors localized at a given point in the configuration space. In the traditional language the only observable measured is position. In section 5 we address the issue of how observables other than position make their appearance within the CAQT approach. We find that these observables are useful concepts in that they facilitate the description of complex experiments but, from our point of view, they are of only secondary importance and play no role at the foundational level.

The prominence awarded within the CAQT to the concept of array entropy stems partly from our choice of subject matter – experimental setups rather than quantum systems – and partly from the fact that it is the array entropy that provides the link between the Shannon information theory entropy and von Neumann's entropy. The short discussion in section 6 shows two ways to introduce von Neumann's entropy. This is an adaptation of the arguments of Jaynes [18] and of Blankenbecler and Partovi [6].

We conclude in section 7 with a summary of our results and a discussion of how various relations and connections among the postulates of quantum theory are made explicit and clarified within the CAQT approach.

2 The consistent-amplitude approach to quantum theory

We proceed in several steps; effectively, each step consists of making an assumption and then exploring its consequences. The first and most crucial assumption is a decision about the subject matter. What problem is quantum mechanics trying to solve? We choose a pragmatic, operational approach: statements

about a system are identified with those experimental setups designed to test them [7][8]. Our strategy is to establish a network of relations among setups in the hope that information about some setups might be helpful in making predictions about others. We find that there are two basic kinds of relations among setups, which we call *and* and *or*. These relations or operations represent our idealized ability to build more complex setups out of simpler ones, either by placing them in "series" or in "parallel".

Let us be more specific. To avoid irrelevant technical distractions we consider a very simple system, a particle that lives on a discrete lattice and has no spin or other internal structure. The generalization to more complex configuration spaces should be straightforward. The simplest experimental setup, denoted by $[x_f, x_i]$, consists of placing a source that prepares the particle at a spacetime point $x_i = (\vec{x}_i, t_i)$ and placing a detector at $x_f = (\vec{x}_f, t_f)$. To test a more complex statement such as "the particle goes from x_i to x_1 and from there to x_f," denoted by $[x_f, x_1, x_i]$, requires a more complex setup involving an idealized device, a "filter" which prevents any motion from x_i to x_f except via the intermediate point x_1. This filter is some sort of obstacle or screen that exists only at time t_1, blocking the particle everywhere in space except for a small "hole" around $\vec{x}_1$. The possibility of introducing many filters each with many holes leads to allowed setups of the general form

$$a = [x_f, s_N, s_{N-1}, \ldots, s_2, s_1, x_i] \ , \tag{1}$$

where $s_n = (x_n, x'_n, x''_n, \ldots)$ is a filter at time t_n, intermediate between t_i and t_f, with holes at $\vec{x}_n, \vec{x}'_n, \vec{x}''_n, \ldots$

The first basic relation among setups, which we call *and*, arises when two setups a and b are placed in immediate succession resulting in a third setup denoted by ab. It is necessary that the destination point of the earlier setup coincide with the source point of the later one, otherwise the combined ab is not allowed. The second relation, called *or*, arises from the possibility of opening additional holes in any given filter. Specifically, when (and *only* when) two setups a' and a'' are identical except on one single filter where none of the holes of a' overlap any of the holes of a'', then we may form a third setup a, denoted by $a' \vee a''$, which includes the holes of both a' and a''. Provided the relevant setups are allowed the basic properties of *and* and *or* are quite obvious: *or* is commutative, but *and* is not; both *and* and *or* are associative, and finally, *and* distributes over *or*. We emphasize that these are physical rather than logical connectives. They represent our idealized ability to construct more complex setups out of simpler ones and they differ substantially from their Boolean and quantum logic counterparts. In Boolean logic not only *and* distributes over *or* but *or* also distributes over *and* while in quantum logic propositions refer to quantum properties at one time rather than to processes in time.

The identification of the *and*/*or* relations, as well as their properties (associativity, distributivity, etc.) is crucial to defining what kind of setups we

are talking about and therefore crucial to establishing the subject of quantum mechanics. Thus, our first assumption is

A1. The goal of quantum theory is to predict the outcomes of experiments involving setups built from components connected through *and* and *or*.

It is important to emphasize that this quantum theory coincides with the standard Copenhagen quantum theory (see [11]). The contribution, at this point, has been to make explicit the relations *and/or* which are normally implicit in the Feynman approach [10].

The next step involves an assumption about the existence of a quantitative tool to handle these relations *and/or*:

A2. A mathematical representation of *and/or* is established by the consistent assignment of a single complex number $\phi(a)$ to each setup a in such a way that relations among setups translate into relations among the corresponding complex numbers.

What gives the theory its robustness, its uniqueness, is the requirement that the assignment be consistent. If there are two different ways to compute the single number $\phi(a)$ is assigned to setup a the two answers must agree. The remarkable consequence of this consistency constraint is the 'regraduation' theorem [8] that all such representations are equivalent: changing representations involves mere changes of variables. Thus, one can always 'regraduate' $\phi(a)$ with a function ψ to switch to an equivalent and more convenient representation, $\psi(a) \equiv \psi(\phi(a))$, in which *and* and *or* are respectively represented by multiplication and addition. Explicitly, $\psi(ab) = \psi(a)\,\psi(b)$ and $\psi(a \vee a') = \psi(a) + \psi(a')$. Anticipating the important role played by these conveniently assigned complex numbers we call them by the suggestive name of 'amplitudes'. These amplitudes have a clear meaning, they are tools for reasoning quantitatively and consistently about the relations *and/or*. For an earlier derivation of the quantum sum and product rules see ref. [20]. For comments on the possibility that such a representation of *and/or* might not exist see ref. [19].

The observation that a single filter that is totally covered with holes is equivalent to having no filter at all leads to the fundamental equation of evolution. The idea is expressed by writing the relation among setups

$$[x_f, x_i] = \bigvee_{\text{all } \vec{x} \text{ at } t} ([x_f, x_t][x_t, x_i]) \tag{2}$$

in terms of the corresponding amplitudes [10]. Using the sum and product rules, we get

$$\psi(x_f, x_i) = \sum_{\text{all } \vec{x} \text{ at } t} \psi(x_f, x_t)\,\psi(x_t, x_i)\ . \tag{3}$$

Following Feynman [10], we introduce the wave function $\Psi(\vec{x}, t)$ as the means to represent those features of the setup prior to t that are relevant to time

evolution after t. Notice that there are many possible combinations of starting points x_i and of interactions prior to the time t that will result in identical evolution after time t. What these different possibilities have in common is that they all lead to the same numerical value for the amplitude $\psi(x_t, x_i)$. Therefore we set $\Psi(\vec{x}, t) = \psi(x_t, x_i)$ and all reference to the irrelevant starting point x_i is omitted. The traditional language is that Ψ describes the state of the particle at time t, that the effect of the interactions was to prepare the particle in state Ψ. Now we see that the word "state" just refers to a concise means of encoding information about the preparation procedure prior to time t that is relevant for the evolution after time t.

The equation of evolution (3) can then be written as

$$\Psi(\vec{x}_f, t_f) = \sum_{\text{all } \vec{x} \text{ at } t} \psi(\vec{x}_f, t_f; \vec{x}, t)\, \Psi(\vec{x}, t), \tag{4}$$

which is equivalent to a linear Schrödinger equation as can easily be seen [7][8] by differentiating with respect to t_f and evaluating at $t_f = t$. Thus, a quantum theory formulated in terms of consistently assigned amplitudes must be linear; nonlinear modifications of quantum mechanics must violate assumptions **A1** or **A2** else be internally inconsistent [19].

The question of how amplitudes or wave functions are used to predict the outcomes of experiments is addressed through the time evolution equation (4). For example, suppose the preparation procedure is such that $\Psi(\vec{x}, t)$ vanishes at a certain point $\vec{x}_0$. Then, according to eq. (4), placing an obstacle at the single point $(\vec{x}_0, t)$ (*i.e.*, placing a filter at t with holes everywhere except at $\vec{x}_0$) should have no effect on the subsequent evolution of Ψ. Since relations among amplitudes are meant to reflect corresponding relations among setups, it is natural to assume that the presence or absence of the obstacle will have no effect on whether detection at x_f occurs or not. Therefore when $\Psi(\vec{x}_0, t) = 0$ we predict that the particle will not be detected at $(\vec{x}_0, t)$. This assumption can be generalized to the following general interpretative rule:

A3. If the introduction at time t of a filter blocking those components of the wave function characterized by a certain property $\mathcal{P}$ has no effect on the future evolution of a particular wave function $\Psi(t)$ then when the wave function happens to be $\Psi(t)$ the property $\mathcal{P}$ will not be detected.

The application of this rule requires a means to quantify the difference between wave functions before and after a filter. In ref. [8] we showed how the interpretative rule **A3** implies the Born postulate provided this difference is measured by a Hilbert norm. In the next section we justify this choice as being the uniquely natural one.

3 The Hilbert inner product

In order to justify the use of the Hilbert norm we show how the concepts of distance and angle among states, that is an inner product, can be physically motivated. The argument has three parts.

First, we note that wave functions form a linear space. To illustrate this point suppose that $\Psi_1(\vec{x},t) = \psi(\vec{x},t;\vec{x}_1,t_0)$ is the wave function at time t of a particle that at time t_0 was prepared at the point $\vec{x}_1$, and $\Psi_2(\vec{x},t) = \psi(\vec{x},t;\vec{x}_2,t_0)$ is the wave function at time t of a particle that at time t_0 was prepared at the point $\vec{x}_2$. It is easy to prepare linear superpositions of $\Psi_1(\vec{x},t)$ and $\Psi_2(\vec{x},t)$ by placing the original source of the particle at an initial point $(\vec{x}_i,t_i)$ with t_i earlier than t_0 and letting the particle evolve through a filter at t_0 with two holes, one at $\vec{x}_1$ and the other at $\vec{x}_2$. Then the amplitude $\psi(\vec{x},t;\vec{x}_i,t_i)$ is

$$\psi(\vec{x},t;\vec{x}_i,t_i) = \psi(\vec{x},t;\vec{x}_1,t_0)\psi(\vec{x}_1,t_0;\vec{x}_i,t_i) + \psi(\vec{x},t;\vec{x}_1,t_0)\psi(\vec{x}_1,t_0;\vec{x}_i,t_i) \ , \quad (5)$$

and, in an obvious notation, the wave function at time t is given by the superposition

$$\Psi(\vec{x},t) = \alpha\Psi_1(\vec{x},t) + \beta\Psi_2(\vec{x},t) \ . \quad (6)$$

Notice that the complex numbers α and β can be changed at will either by changing the starting point $(\vec{x}_i,t_i)$ or by modifying the setup between t_i and t_0 in any arbitrary way.

It is interesting that within the CAQT approach there is a deep connection between the linearity of the space of wave functions and the linearity of time evolution: they both follow from the same sum and product rules, and ultimately, from consistency. In contrast, within the traditional approach [9][4] the two forms of linearity are seemingly unrelated; the first is a kinematical feature while the second is dynamical. In fact, attempts to formulate non linear variants of quantum theory give up the second linearity, that of time evolution, while invariably preserving the first [21].

The second part of the argument is to point out that the basic components of setups, the filters, already supply us with a concept of orthogonality without invoking any additional assumptions.

The action of a filter P at time t with holes at a set of points $\vec{x}_p$ is to turn the wave function $\Psi(\vec{x})$ into the wave function

$$P\Psi(\vec{x}) = \sum_p \delta_{\vec{x},\vec{x}_p}\Psi(\vec{x}) \ . \quad (7)$$

Since filters P act as projectors, $P^2 = P$, any given filter defines two special classes of wave functions. One is the subspace of those wave functions such as $\Psi_P \equiv P\Psi$ that are unaffected by the filter, $P\Psi_P = \Psi_P$. The other is the subspace of those wave functions that are totally blocked by the filter, such as $\Psi_{1-P} \equiv (1-P)\Psi$, for which $P\Psi_{1-P} = 0$. We will say that these two subspaces are orthogonal to each other.

Any wave function can be decomposed into orthogonal components,

$$\Psi = P\Psi + (1-P)\Psi = \Psi_P + \Psi_{1-P} \ . \tag{8}$$

A particularly convenient expansion in orthogonal components is that defined by a complete set of elementary filters. The filter P_i is elementary if it has a single hole at $\vec{x}_i$, it acts by multiplying $\Psi(\vec{x})$ by $\delta_{\vec{x},\vec{x}_i}$ and the set is complete if

$$\sum_i P_i = 1 \ . \tag{9}$$

Then

$$\Psi(\vec{x}) = \sum_i P_i \Psi(\vec{x}) = \sum_i A_i \, \delta_{\vec{x},\vec{x}_i} \ . \tag{10}$$

where $A_i = \Psi(\vec{x}_i)$ and for $i \neq j$ the basis wave functions $\delta_{\vec{x},\vec{x}_i}$ and $\delta_{\vec{x},\vec{x}_j}$ are orthogonal.

In the third and last step of our argument, as a matter of convenience, we switch to the familiar Dirac notation. Instead of writing $\Psi(\vec{x})$ and $\delta_{\vec{x},\vec{x}_i}$ we shall write $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|i\rangle$, so that

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i A_i |i\rangle \ . \tag{11}$$

The question is what else, in addition to the notion of orthogonality described above, is needed to determine a unique inner product. Recall that an inner product satisfies three conditions:

(a) $\langle\Psi|\Psi\rangle \geqslant 0$ with $\langle\Psi|\Psi\rangle = 0$ if and only if $|\Psi\rangle = 0$,

(b) linearity in the second factor $\langle\Phi|\alpha_1\Psi_1 + \alpha_2\Psi_2\rangle = \alpha_1\langle\Phi|\Psi_1\rangle + \alpha_2\langle\Phi|\Psi_2\rangle$,

(c) antilinearity in the first factor, $\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle = \langle\Psi|\Phi\rangle^*$.

Conditions (b) and (c) determine the product of the state $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_j B_j|j\rangle$ with $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i A_i|i\rangle$ in terms of the product of $|j\rangle$ with $|i\rangle$,

$$\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i B_j^* A_i \langle j|i\rangle \ . \tag{12}$$

The orthogonality of the basis functions $\delta_{\vec{x},\vec{x}_i}$ is easily encoded into the inner product, just set $\langle j|i\rangle = 0$ for $i \neq j$. But the case $i = j$ remains undetermined, constrained only by condition (a) to be real and positive. Clearly, an additional ingredient is needed and to find it we reason as follows.

Suppose, that some prediction is made concerning the detection of the particle at $\vec{x}_i$ when the state is $|\Psi\rangle$ (eq. 11). Consider now another state $|\Psi'\rangle = \sum_i A_i|i+k\rangle$ obtained from $|\Psi\rangle$ by a mere translation. What prediction should we make concerning detection at $\vec{x}_{i+k}$? Since relations among amplitudes are

meant to reflect corresponding relations among setups, it seems natural to assume that the latter prediction should coincide with the former. As we show below this is achieved if we set $\langle i|i\rangle = \langle i+k|i+k\rangle$, that is, we choose $\langle i|i\rangle$ equal to a constant which, without losing generality, we may set equal to one. Therefore,

$$\langle i|j\rangle = \delta_{ij} \ . \tag{13}$$

This fixes a unique inner product

$$\langle \Phi|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i B_i^* A_i \ , \tag{14}$$

and yields the Hilbert norm

$$\|\Psi\|^2 \equiv \langle \Psi|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i |A_i|^2 \ . \tag{15}$$

Thus, we have arrived at the first main result of this paper: *the principle of insufficient reason enters quantum theory through the inner product.* Our assumption can in general be stated as

A4. If there is no reason to prefer one region of configuration space over another they should be assigned equal a priori weight.

One should point out that the symmetry argument invoked here and the usual symmetry arguments leading to conservation laws through Noether's theorem are of a very different nature. The latter depends strongly on the particular form of the Hamiltonian, on the dynamics; the former is totally independent of the Hamiltonian.

The deduction of the Born statistical rule now proceeds as in ref. [8]. Briefly the idea is as follows. We want to predict the outcome of an experiment in which a detector is placed at a certain $\vec{x}_k$ when the system is in state (11). In [8] we showed that the state for an ensemble of N identically prepared, independent replicas of our particle is the product

$$|\Psi_N\rangle = \prod_{\alpha=1}^{N} |\Psi_\alpha\rangle = \sum_{i_1 \ldots i_N} A_{i_1} \ldots A_{i_N} \, |i_N\rangle ... |i_1\rangle \ . \tag{16}$$

Suppose that in the N-particle configuration space we place a special filter, denoted by $P^k_{f,\varepsilon}$, the action of which is to block all components of $|\Psi_N\rangle$ except those for which the fraction n/N of replicas at $\vec{x}_k$ lies in the range from $f-\varepsilon$ to $f+\varepsilon$. The action of such a filter is represented by the projector

$$P^k_{f,\varepsilon} = \sum_{n=(f-\varepsilon)N}^{(f+\varepsilon)N} P^k_n \ , \tag{17}$$

where the P_n^k are themselves projectors that select those components of $|\Psi_N\rangle$ for which the number of replicas at $\vec{x}_k$ is exactly n,

$$P_n^k = \sum_{i_1 \ldots i_N} |i_N\rangle \ldots |i_1\rangle \delta_{n,n_k} \langle i_1| \ldots \langle i_N| \qquad \text{where} \qquad n_k = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N} \delta_{k,i_\alpha} \ . \tag{18}$$

Next we prepare to apply the interpretative rule: we want to know whether for large N the state $P_{f,\varepsilon}^k|\Psi_N\rangle$ after the filter differs or not from the state $|\Psi_N\rangle$ before the filter. The distance between $P_{f,\varepsilon}^k|\Psi_N\rangle$ and $|\Psi_N\rangle$, measured by the norm,

$$\left\| P_{f,\varepsilon}^k|\Psi_N\rangle - |\Psi_N\rangle \right\|^2 \ , \tag{19}$$

need not converge as $N \to \infty$, but the relative distance

$$\frac{\left\| P_{f,\varepsilon}^k|\Psi_N\rangle - |\Psi_N\rangle \right\|^2}{\left\| |\Psi_N\rangle \right\|^2} \tag{20}$$

does. The calculation is straightforward [8]. We first normalize $|\Psi\rangle$,

$$\langle \Psi|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i |A_i|^2 = 1 \ , \tag{21}$$

so that $\langle \Psi_N|\Psi_N\rangle = 1$ and the relative distance (20) coincides with (19). The result is

$$\left\| P_{f,\varepsilon}^k|\Psi_N\rangle - |\Psi_N\rangle \right\|^2 = 1 - \sum_{n=(f-\varepsilon)N}^{(f+\varepsilon)N} \binom{N}{n} \left(|A_k|^2\right)^n \left(1 - |A_k|^2\right)^{N-n} \ . \tag{22}$$

For large N this binomial sum tends to the integral of a Gaussian with mean $\overline{f} = |A_k|^2$ and variance $\sigma_N^2 = \overline{f}(1-\overline{f})/N$. In the limit $N \to \infty$ this is more concisely written as a δ function. Therefore

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \left\| P_{f,\varepsilon}^k|\Psi_N\rangle - |\Psi_N\rangle \right\|^2 = 1 - \int_{f-\varepsilon}^{f+\varepsilon} \delta\left(f' - |A_k|^2\right) df'. \tag{23}$$

This shows that for large N the filter $P_{f,\varepsilon}^k$ has a negligible effect on the state $|\Psi_N\rangle$ provided f lies in a range 2ε about $|A_k|^2$. Therefore, according to the interpretative rule **A3**, the state $|\Psi_N\rangle$ does not contain any fractions outside this range. On choosing stricter filters with $\varepsilon \to 0$, we conclude that detection at $\vec{x}_k$ will occur for a fraction $|A_k|^2$ of the replicas and that it will not occur for a fraction $1 - |A_k|^2$. For any one of the *identical* individual replicas however, there is no such certainty; the best one can do is to say that detection will occur

with a certain probability $\Pr(k)$. In order to be consistent with the law of large numbers the assigned value must be,

$$\Pr(k) = |A_k|^2 \,. \tag{24}$$

Theoretical arguments always involve idealizations which if taken literally are clearly unrealistic. Some, such as the limit $N \to \infty$, are obviously unphysical and yet routinely recognized as useful. But in other cases legitimate doubts may arise. One may, for example, question whether in invoking filters such as $P^k_{f,\varepsilon}$ acting on the N-particle configuration space and selecting wave function components with a very peculiar property $\mathcal{P}$ the idealizations are being pushed too far. While recognizing that attempts to persuade all skeptics are doomed to fail, perhaps the following two-dimensional example, borrowed from [23], may be of some help.

Consider the special case where the single particle state (11) contains just two terms, say $|\Psi\rangle = A_1|1\rangle + A_2|2\rangle$. This is analogous to a spin 1/2 particle. To pursue this analogy imagine the individual spins of the N-particle ensemble are conveniently arranged in a little crystal. This ensemble would have definite fractions of particles with spin up (say, $|1\rangle$) without any individual spin being itself definitely up or down. One way to determine this fraction consists of sending the little crystal through a suitable Stern-Gerlach device to measure its total spin by observing how it is deflected from the original trajectory. The filter $P^k_{f,\varepsilon}$ is easy to visualize: it is just a slit that allows passage when the deflection has the appropriate value. According to the interpretative rule **A3** the property $\mathcal{P}$ detected is that the fraction of particles with spin up is $|A_1|^2$. The state of the ensemble $|\Psi_N\rangle$ as well as the state of each individual spin remains unchanged in such a measurement.

But there is a second way to determine the definite value of the fraction of spins up; it consists of detecting each individual spin and counting the number with spin up. This second method will affect the state of the ensemble as well as the state of each individual spin but it is a legitimate way of detecting the same property $\mathcal{P}$ and whatever the result it should agree with the previous method. Since there is a definite fraction of spin up results and a definite fraction of spin down results for an individual particle one can make no definite prediction. The best we can do is assign a probability $|A_1|^2$ that the outcome will be spin up.

In our case we are concerned with position rather than spin but suitable modifications are conceivable; perhaps the required 'Stern-Gerlach' device could directly measure the center of mass of the ensemble rather than its total magnetization.

After this digression, let us return to assumption **A4** and further explore its implications. Suppose, for example, that the sites of the discrete lattice on which the particle 'moves' are unevenly spaced. Then there is no reason to give equal weights to different $|i\rangle$'s. The consequences of choosing a different normalization $\langle i|j\rangle = w_i\delta_{ij}$ are easy to track down: the weighted inner product

of $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_j B_j|j\rangle$ with $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i A_i|i\rangle$ becomes

$$\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i w_i B_i^* A_i \ , \tag{25}$$

the completeness relation (9) becomes

$$1 = \sum_i P_i = \sum_i w_i^{-1}|i\rangle\,\langle i| \ , \tag{26}$$

and the probability of detection at $\vec{x}_k$ would not be given by the Born rule but rather by $\Pr(k) = w_k|A_k|^2$.

An appealing but still arbitrary choice is to weight each cell of the lattice by its own volume which we write as $w_i = g_i^{1/2}\Delta x$. This is particularly interesting in the continuum limit $\Delta x \to 0$. First, write the completeness relation (9) as

$$1 = \sum_i g_i^{1/2}\Delta x \frac{|i\rangle}{g_i^{1/2}\Delta x}\frac{\langle i|}{g_i^{1/2}\Delta x} \ . \tag{27}$$

On replacing $g_i^{1/2}\Delta x$ by $g^{1/2}dx$ and $(g_i^{1/2}\Delta x)^{-1}|i\rangle$ by $|\vec{x}\rangle$ the new completeness condition becomes

$$\int g^{1/2}dx\,|\vec{x}\rangle\,\langle\vec{x}| = 1 \ . \tag{28}$$

Next, replace $\delta_{ij}/\Delta x$ by $\delta(\vec{x}-\vec{x}')$ and the inner product $\langle i|j\rangle = g_i^{1/2}\Delta x\,\delta_{ij}$ becomes

$$\langle\vec{x}|\vec{x}'\rangle = g^{-1/2}\delta(\vec{x}-\vec{x}') \ . \tag{29}$$

Furthermore, on replacing A_i by $A(\vec{x})$, the state $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i A_i\,|i\rangle$ becomes

$$|\Psi\rangle = \int g^{1/2}dx\ A(\vec{x})\,|\vec{x}\rangle \ , \tag{30}$$

and the Born rule $\Pr(i) = w_i|A_i|^2$ becomes

$$\Pr(dx) = g^{1/2}dx\,|A(\vec{x})|^2 \ . \tag{31}$$

As expected, $|A(\vec{x})|^2$ is the probability density. These results apply to situations where the homogeneity of space is hidden by an inconvenient choice of coordinates, and also to intrinsically inhomogeneous, curved spaces.

We see that the Born rule follows, even in curved spaces, from giving the same a priori weight, the same preference, to spatial volume elements that are equal. This is a perhaps unexpected connection between quantum theory and the geometry of space and one suspects that it is not accidental. It is tempting to invert the logic and *assign* equal volumes to spatial regions that are equally preferred. This would *explain* what a physical volume is: just a measure of a priori preference. The full implications of these remarks remain to be explored.

4 Array entropy and unitary time evolution

In a situation of optimal information everything that is relevant about the experimental setup prior to time $t = 0$ is known, then the wave function $\Psi(\vec{x}, 0)$ is known. But if less information is available perhaps the best we can do is conclude that the actual preparation procedure was one among several possibilities $\alpha = 1, 2, 3, ...$ each one with a certain probability p_α. For simplicity we initially assume these possibilities form a discrete set. The usual linguistic trap is to say *the system* is in state $\Psi_\alpha(\vec{x}, 0)$ with probability p_α, but it is better to say that *the preparation procedure* is $\Psi_\alpha(\vec{x}, 0)$ with probability p_α [25]. To this state of knowledge, which one may represent as a set of weighted points in Hilbert space, and which Jaynes referred to as an array [18][26], one can associate an entropy, called the array entropy

$$S_A = -\sum_\alpha p_\alpha \log p_\alpha \ . \tag{32}$$

A valid objection to using this quantity as the entropy of the quantum system is that if the $\Psi_\alpha(\vec{x}, 0)$ are not orthogonal then the p_α are not the probabilities of mutually exclusive events. When regarded as a property or an attribute of the quantum system the various $\Psi_\alpha(\vec{x}, 0)$ need not, in fact, be mutually exclusive; if $\langle\Psi_\alpha|\Psi_\beta\rangle \neq 0$, knowing that the system is in $\Psi_\alpha(\vec{x}, 0)$ does not exclude the possibility that it will be found in $\Psi_\beta(\vec{x}, 0)$. However, if the $\Psi_\alpha(\vec{x}, 0)$ are attributes of the preparation procedure then they are mutually exclusive because the preparation devices are macroscopic! S_A is a useful concept when interpreted as the entropy of the whole setup and not as the entropy of the quantum system.

The importance of this conceptual point cannot be overemphasized and a more explicit illustration may clarify it further. Consider a spin 1/2 particle prepared either with spin along the z direction or with spin along the x direction. These states are not orthogonal and by 'looking' at the particle there is no sure way to tell which of the two alternatives holds, and yet nothing prevents one from looking directly at the macroscopic Stern-Gerlach magnets. This will reveal which of the two mutually exclusive orientations was used without affecting the wave function. One can distinguish non-orthogonal states by looking at the macroscopic devices that prepared the system rather than by looking at the system itself.

Turning to the issue of time evolution, we consider situations where those parts of the setup after time 0 are known and no further uncertainty is introduced. Under these conditions the points of the new array are shifted from $\Psi_\alpha(\vec{x}, 0)$ to $\Psi_\alpha(\vec{x}, t)$ but their probabilities p_α and the corresponding array entropy S_A remain unchanged.

The uncertainty discussed in the previous paragraphs led to a probability distribution defined over a discrete array but, in general, we may have to deal

with a continuous array. This is of considerable significance for the issue of time evolution.

The simplest continuous array is one dimensional, a weighted curve C in Hilbert space. We could consider higher dimensional arrays but this would unnecessarily obscure the argument that follows. The reparametrization-invariant entropy of this continuous array is [24]

$$S_A = -\int_C d\alpha\, p(\alpha)\, \log\, \frac{p(\alpha)}{\ell(\alpha)}\ , \tag{33}$$

where $p(\alpha)d\alpha$ is the probability that the preparation procedure lies in the interval between α and $\alpha + d\alpha$ and $\ell(\alpha)d\alpha$ is a measure of the distance in Hilbert space between $\Psi_\alpha(\vec{x}, 0)$ and $\Psi_{\alpha+d\alpha}(\vec{x}, 0)$. As discussed in the last section the Hilbert norm is the uniquely natural choice of distance, thus $\ell(\alpha)d\alpha = \||\Psi_{\alpha+d\alpha}\rangle - |\Psi_\alpha\rangle\|$.

Again we consider setups for which no further uncertainty is introduced between times 0 and t. We find that points $\Psi_\alpha(\vec{x}, 0)$ of the old line array at $t = 0$ will move to points $\Psi_\alpha(\vec{x}, t)$ to form a new line array at time t. Since no information was lost between times 0 and t we expect that, just as in the discrete case, the probabilities $p(\alpha)d\alpha$ remain unchanged and the corresponding array entropy S_A is conserved. But entropy conservation,

$$\frac{\partial S_A}{\partial t} = \int_C d\alpha\ \frac{p(\alpha)}{\ell(\alpha)}\, \frac{\partial \ell(\alpha)}{\partial t} = 0\ , \tag{34}$$

should hold for any curve C and any function $p(\alpha)$, therefore

$$\frac{\partial \ell(\alpha)}{\partial t} = 0\ . \tag{35}$$

The conservation of the array entropy leads to the conservation of Hilbert space distances. Since linear transformations that preserve the Hilbert norm are called unitary we conclude that time evolution is given by a unitary transformation. The Hamiltonian must be Hermitian; energy eigenvalues are real.

In the argument above it is implicit that

A′5. The experimental setups about which we wish to make predictions involve no loss of information.

This assumption is of a somewhat different nature than the previous ones – thus the prime. Since the objective of **A′5** is to specify more precisely what are the experimental setups we are dealing with, **A′5** is in effect contributing to define the subject of quantum theory. It may, therefore, be more appropriate to include **A′5** as part of **A1**. On the other hand, one can also make the case that **A′5** is already implicit in **A2**: it is only to those setups that have been optimally specified that one can assign a single complex number. In any case, the purpose of **A′5** is to make explicit that in these setups entropy must be conserved.

5 Observables other than position

The experiments we have discussed involve position detectors. One could say we have only considered position 'measurements', but this usage of the word 'measurement' requires some caution. The problem is that it suggests that before the 'measurement' the particle had a position, the value of which, albeit unknown, was very definite. This is an assumption that need not and should not be made; statements about whether the particle has a position or not should be avoided. These statements are not identifiable with experimental setups, and according to our assumption **A1**, they are foreign to the subject matter of CAQT; they are not even wrong, they are meaningless. What has a definite position is the detector, not the particle [27].

The issue we address next concerns other observables, how they are 'measured' and what role they play.

To build more complex detectors one can modify the setup just prior to the final position detection at $\vec{x}_f$ by introducing, for example, additional magnetic fields or diffraction gratings. Suppose that the setup prior to time t prepares the system in a certain state. After time t the time evolution will in general be given by eq. (4) but suppose that interactions between the time t and the time of detection t_f are arranged in such a way that if the wave function happened to be the function $\Phi_j(\vec{x},t)$ then at the later time t_f the new wave function $\phi_j(\vec{x},t_f)$ would vanish everywhere except at $\vec{x}_j$,

$$\phi_j(\vec{x}_f,t_f) = \sum_{\text{all } \vec{x}} \psi(\vec{x}_f,t_f;\vec{x},t)\,\Phi_j(\vec{x},t) = \delta_{\vec{x}_f,\vec{x}_j}. \tag{36}$$

In this special case the particle would be detected at $\vec{x}_j$ with certainty and we would say that "at time t_f the particle was found at $\vec{x}_j$". Alternatively, we could describe this same result and convey additional relevant information about the setup by saying that "at time t the particle was found in state $\Phi_j(\vec{x},t)$". Thus, the latter form of speech, although somewhat inappropriate, has the virtue of being more informative.

The generalization is straightforward: arrange interactions so that each state $\Phi_j(\vec{x},t)$ of a complete and orthogonal set is made to evolve to a corresponding state $\phi_j(\vec{x},t_f) = \delta_{\vec{x},\vec{x}_j}$. The wave function at time t can be expanded

$$\Psi(\vec{x},t) = \sum_j a_j\,\Phi_j(\vec{x},t), \tag{37}$$

and this evolves to

$$\Psi(\vec{x},t_f) = \sum_j a_j \delta_{\vec{x},\vec{x}_j}. \tag{38}$$

Invoking the Born rule we interpret this as "the probability that at time t_f the particle is found at $\vec{x}_j$ is $|a_j|^2$," or alternatively, and somewhat inappropriately,

that "the probability that at time t the particle is found in state $\Phi_j(\vec{x},t)$ is $|a_j|^2$."

What this particular complex detector 'measures' is all observables of the form $Q=\sum_n f_n|\Phi_n\rangle\langle\Phi_n|$ where the f_n are arbitrary scalars.

Notice that unitary evolution is a crucial requirement. In order for the expansion (37) to be unique the states $\Phi_n(\vec{x},t)$ must form a complete and orthogonal set which itself must evolve to the also orthogonal set of $\phi_n(\vec{x},t_f)=\delta_{\vec{x},\vec{x}_n}$. The orthogonality must be preserved. One cannot introduce this notion of observables until after the issue of unitary time evolution has been settled.

Notice also that it is not necessary that the operator Q have real eigenvalues, but it is necessary that its eigenvectors $|\Phi_n\rangle$ be orthogonal. This means that the Hermitian and anti-Hermitian parts of Q must be simultaneously diagonalizable. Thus, while the observable Q does not have to be Hermitian ($Q=Q^\dagger$) it must certainly be *normal*, that is $QQ^\dagger=Q^\dagger Q$.

It is amusing to reflect that if the sentence "at time t a particle has momentum $\vec{p}$" is used only as a linguistic shortcut that conveys the information that the wave function assigned to the setup prior to time t was $exp(i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}/\hbar)$ then, strictly speaking, there is no such thing as the momentum of the particle. The point is that wave functions attach to setups and not to particles; whatever $\vec{p}$ is, it is not a property of the particle by itself, but of the whole setup.

6 von Neumann's entropy

We saw that the array entropy (32) is an acceptable measure of uncertainty provided it is associated with the whole experimental setup rather than the quantum system by itself. This interpretation hinged on the fact that preparations are made using macroscopic devices with definite attributes that are in principle distinguishable and mutually exclusive even when the corresponding wave functions Ψ_α are not orthogonal.

But suppose that for some unspecified reason the part of the experimental setup responsible for the preparation is not directly accessible to observation and we can only look at the detectors themselves. This is what happens when the actual purpose of the experiment is to obtain information about the preparation procedure. Many, maybe most experiments are of this kind. We can, for example, detect photons to obtain information about how they were originally prepared in a distant star, and thereby we learn about the star; or we can detect photons to find how they were prepared at the other end of a communication channel, and thereby we receive a message. In these cases a more useful, more relevant entropy might be one that measures the uncertainty about how the detectors will respond.

Consider measuring an arbitrary observable $Q=\sum_n f_n|\Phi_n\rangle\langle\Phi_n|$ in a situation where the preparation procedure is uncertain. If the wave function is $\Psi_\alpha(\vec{x},0)$ with probability p_α the probability that the system is detected in state

$|\Phi_n\rangle$ is

$$p_n^Q = \sum_\alpha p_\alpha \left|\langle\Phi_n|\Psi_\alpha\rangle\right|^2 = \langle\Phi_n|\rho|\Phi_n\rangle, \tag{39}$$

where ρ is the density operator

$$\rho = \sum_\alpha p_\alpha |\Psi_\alpha\rangle\langle\Psi_\alpha|. \tag{40}$$

Thus, knowledge of ρ allows one to compute the probability of all experimental outcomes. An important implication of this result is that if all we can observe are the detectors then two different arrays with the same density operator ρ are indistinguishable; they yield experimental outcomes that are statistically identical no matter what experiment is performed. To distinguish among such arrays requires information which, in practice, is just not available. A second important feature is that since ρ is Hermitian it can be diagonalized, *i.e.*,

$$\rho = \sum_\beta w_\beta |w_\beta\rangle\langle w_\beta| \ , \tag{41}$$

where $\langle w_\beta|w_\gamma\rangle = \delta_{\beta\gamma}$. Therefore, the set of all arrays with the same ρ includes an array that is orthogonal.

The von Neumann entropy can now be introduced in either of two ways. First, we note that two different arrays with the same ρ need not have the same array entropy. What is remarkable is that even though for one array one might have a higher uncertainty about the preparation procedure this will not diminish our ability to predict the response of the detectors. As far as the detectors are concerned the additional uncertainty was irrelevant. The *relevant* uncertainty of all these arrays with the same ρ is the minimum value that the array entropy can attain. It can be shown that the minimizing array is the orthogonal one [18] (see also [28]). The corresponding entropy is von Neumann's

$$S_{vN}(\rho) = \min_A S_A\Big|_\rho = -\sum_\beta w_\beta \log w_\beta = -\operatorname{Tr}\rho\log\rho \ , \tag{42}$$

Notice that one cannot use the von Neumann entropy introduced in this first way to argue that time evolution must be unitary. If no information is dissipated one can reasonably expect that the array entropy of an array at time t_1 should coincide with the array entropy at a later time t_2, but there is no reason to expect that the *relevant* part of these uncertainties should also coincide. In other words, a priori there is no reason to assume that it is the orthogonal array at t_1 that evolves into the orthogonal array at t_2.

A second way to introduce von Neumann's entropy is to focus attention directly on the response of the detectors. The uncertainty about which detector will fire when the observable Q is being measured is given by the so called *measurement* entropy

$$S(\rho|Q) = -\sum_n p_n^Q \log p_n^Q \ . \tag{43}$$

with p_n^Q given by (39). Notice that even if we have optimal information about the preparation procedure, that is, even if ρ represents a pure state, the measurement entropy need not vanish – there remains the uncertainty introduced by the measurement itself which is given by the Born rule probabilities. This indicates that $S(\rho|Q)$ receives contributions from both the uncertainty in the preparation procedure and from the measurement itself. Naturally, the latter will depend on the choice of the observable Q. If one seeks a measure of the uncertainty in the preparation procedure one should choose that Q which makes the least contribution to $S(\rho|Q)$. The desired observable is ρ itself [6] and the corresponding entropy is von Neumann's,

$$S_{vN}(\rho) = \min_Q S(\rho|Q) = S(\rho|\rho) = -\operatorname{Tr}\rho\log\rho. \tag{44}$$

Notice, again, that one cannot use the von Neumann entropy introduced in this second way to argue that time evolution must be unitary. The problem is that, as discussed in the previous section, the possibility of measuring arbitrary observables Q can only be established after the issue of unitary time evolution has been settled.

To summarize, whichever way one chooses to introduce it, von Neumann's entropy represents that component of the uncertainty in the preparation procedures that is relevant to the response of the detectors.

7 Final remarks

The main goal of the CAQT is to justify the formalism of quantum theory on the basis of rather general assumptions. An important by-product is that it has revealed interesting connections among the various postulates of quantum theory. To illustrate this point and, in this context, summarize our main results, consider the following standard set of postulates:

P1 The states of a quantum system are represented by elements $|\psi\rangle$ in a linear space (**P1a**) with an inner product (**P2a**), *i.e.*, the $|\psi\rangle$ are vectors in a Hilbert space.

P2 The time evolution $|\psi(t)\rangle = U(t)\ |\psi(0)\rangle$ is given by an operator $U(t)$ which is both linear (**P2a**) and unitary (**P2b**).

P3 Every observable $\mathcal{A}$ is represented by a Hermitian operator A. The outcome of a measurement of observable $\mathcal{A}$ is one of the eigenvalues a of the corresponding operator A, $A|a\rangle = a|a\rangle$.

P4 The Born postulate: the probability that the measurement of $\mathcal{A}$ in a system in the normalized state $|\psi\rangle$ yields the eigenvalue a is given by $|\langle a|\psi\rangle|^{\,2}$.

P5 The projection postulate: after a measurement that yields the eigenvalue a the system is left in the eigenstate $|a\rangle$.

Consider first a possible connection between **P1** and **P2**. The idea that the wave function is just a way to codify whatever information is relevant for the purpose of making predictions about the future implies that an adequate specification of the state will necessarily depend on the nature of the laws ruling time evolution. Conversely, deciding on a law of time evolution will depend on what it is that is evolving. But this connection between **P1** and **P2** is not explicit in the usual approach. For example, both postulates **P1a** and **P2a** refer to linearity, but these seem to be unrelated, independent linearities. It appears possible to give up the dynamical linearity in **P2a** while preserving the kinematical linearity in **P1a**. In the traditional approaches to quantum mechanics the kinematical aspects of the theory are kept isolated from the dynamical ones. In contrast, within the CAQT approach kinematics and dynamics are unified into a single structure and, in particular, there is only one linearity, which follows from the consistency constraint in the form of the sum and product rules. The resulting formalism is more rigid, more robust; small modifications are not tolerated.

The remaining postulates **P3**, **P4** and **P5** deal with observations and measurements. Since these physical processes are themselves ruled by **P1** and **P2**, it should be the case that the first two postulates already have a lot to say about what is and is not observable and what the allowed outcomes of measurements should be; parts of **P3**, **P4** and **P5** are redundant. We find that **P3** and **P5** are redundant except those aspects that refer to experiments involving position detectors. Other observables are useful and convenient but not crucial. For these observables **P3** makes no contribution beyond what is already contained in **P1** and **P2**.

We have also found that unitary time evolution **P2b** and the Born probability rule **P4** are linked in yet another way, they both follow from the Hilbert inner product **P1b** which is itself a consequence of a form the Principle of Insufficient Reason embodied in our assumption **A4**.

The Born probability rule **P4** is replaced by a milder and more compelling assumption, the general interpretative rule **A3** which does not mention probabilities. From the point of view of the CAQT indeterminism arises as a consequence of our assumption **A2** that a *single* complex number provides an optimal means of codifying information about a setup and this information, while optimal, is definitely not sufficient. At this point it is still an open question whether more information could be codified into a single 'larger' mathematical object (say, a matrix) satisfying the associativity and distributivity requirements [29][30]. In any case the mystery remains: why complex numbers? Our assumption **A4** has made explicit what is an intriguing and perhaps unexpected connection between the Hilbert inner product and spatial measures of volume. Perhaps the reason for complex numbers will be found in the geometry of space.

Lastly, we comment on the pragmatic interpretation implicit in the CAQT approach. The interpretation and the formalism are irremediably entangled form the very beginning. Already from assumption **A1** the CAQT will make no

attempt to offer a model, a description of an underlying objective reality (the existence of which is, however, never doubted). Depending on one's prejudices this may either be totally unsatisfactory or it may be highly desirable. It incorporates the deep insight of Bohr and Heisenberg that the subject of physics is one step removed from reality. Physics does not model reality itself, it models information about reality.

The interpretation of the wave function follows from assumption **A2**: amplitudes and wave functions are tools for reasoning. It is interesting that since $\Psi(t)$ refers to a certain experiment and $\Psi(t+\delta t)$ to another, different, albeit closely related experiment, it is inappropriate to say that $\Psi(t)$ has 'moved' to $\Psi(t+\delta t)$. Wave functions 'evolve' in a sense that is somewhat analogous to the changes between successive frames in a film; there may be an illusion but there is no real motion. Thus the Schrödinger equation is not an equation of motion, it is an equation of evolution. Wave functions do not move and consequently they do not collapse either.

While this pragmatic interpretation coincides in its most crucial aspects with the Copenhagen interpretation [11] there are some differences. There is no need to invoke complementary features for the description of the quantum system because the CAQT never attempts such a description in the first place. The doctrine of complementarity is not needed, and in fact it would represent a step in the wrong direction, a half-hearted attempt to peek behind the curtain and at least partially describe 'what is really going on'. Similarly, since quantities are not associated to the system by itself there is no need to assert that the values of certain quantities associated to the system are created by acts of measurement. In fact, there is no 'measurement.'

Acknowledgments- I am indebted to C. Rodríguez for many valuable discussions. Correspondence with J. Hartle and L. Schulmann on the issue of the Hilbert norm is also gratefully acknowledged.

References

[1] C. E. Shannon, Bell Systems Tech. Jour. **27**, 379, 623 (1948), reprinted in C. E. Shannon and W. Weaver "The Mathematical Theory of Communication" (Univ. of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1949); see also

[2] "E. T. Jaynes: Papers on Probability, Statistics and Statistical Physics," edited by R. D. Rosenkrantz (Reidel, Dordrecht, 1983).

[3] S. Kullback, "Information Theory and Statistics" (Wiley, 1959); J. Shore and R. Johnson, IEEE Trans. on Information Theory, **IT-26**, 26 (1980); J. Skilling, in "Maximum Entropy and Bayesian Methods in Science and Engineering" edited by G. J. Erickson and C. R. Smith (Kluwer, 1988).

[4] J. von Neumann, "Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics" (Princeton, 1955).

[5] see *e.g.*: D. Deutsch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 631 (1983); M. H. Partovi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1883 (1983); R. Balian, Eur. J. Phys. **10**, 208 (1989); W. H. Zurek, "Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information" (Addison-Wesley, 1990).

[6] R. Blankenbecler and M. H. Partovi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 373 (1985).

[7] A. Caticha, Phys. Lett. **A244**, 13 (1998) (quant-ph/9803086).

[8] A. Caticha, Phys. Rev. **A57**, 1572 (1998) (quant-ph/9804012).

[9] P. A. M. Dirac, "The Principles of Quantum Mechanics," (Oxford, 1958).

[10] R. P. Feynman, Rev. Mod. Phys. **20**, 267 (1948); R. P. Feynman and A. R. Hibbs, "Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals" (McGraw-Hill, 1965).

[11] H. Stapp, Am. J. Phys. **40**, 1098 (1972); M. Jammer, "The Philosophy of Quantum Mechanics" (Wiley, 1974) and references therein.

[12] The fact that Born's postulate is actually a theorem has been independently discovered several times: A. M. Gleason, J. Rat. Mech. Anal. **6**, 885 (1957); D. Finkelstein, Trans. NY Acad. Sci. **25**, 621 (1963); J. B. Hartle, Am. J. Phys. **36**, 704 (1968); N. Graham, in "The Many-Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics" edited by B. S. DeWitt and N. Graham (Princeton, 1973). The limit $N \to \infty$ where N is the number of replicas of the system is further discussed in [23] and [30].

[13] For a brief description of some of these ideas see: A. Caticha, "Probability and Entropy in Quantum Theory", to appear in the proceedings of the Eighteenth International Workshop on Maximum Entropy and Bayesian Methods, MaxEnt '98 (July 1998, Garching, Germany) (quant-ph/9808023).

[14] T. F. Jordan, Am. J. Phys. 59, 606 (1991); N. Gisin, Am. J. Phys. 61, 86 (1993).

[15] R. T. Cox, Am. J. Phys. **14**, 1 (1946).

[16] E. P. Wigner, "Group Theory" (Academic, New York, 1959); G. Emch and C. Piron, J. Math. Phys. **4**, 469 (1963).

[17] W. Daniel, Helv. Phys. Acta **55**, 330 (1982); N. Gisin, J. Math. Phys. **24**, 1779 (1983).

[18] E. T. Jaynes, Phys. Rev. **108**, 171 (1957), reprinted in [2].

[19] A. Caticha, "The assumptions underlying the consistent-amplitude approach to quantum theory", (quant-ph/9809066).

[20] Y. Tikochinsky, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **27**, 543 (1988) and J. Math. Phys. (1988).

[21] See for example: L. de Broglie "Non-Linear Wave Mechanics-A Causal Interpretation," (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1950); P. Pearle, Phys. Rev. **D13**, 857 (1976); I. Bialynicki-Birula and J. Mycielski, Ann. Phys. (NY) **100**, 62 (1976); A. Shimony, Phys. Rev. **A20**, 394 (1979); S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Let. **62**, 485 (1989), and Ann. Phys. (NY) **194**, 336 (1989); N. Gisin, Helv. Phys. Acta **62**, 363 (1989) and Phys. Lett. **143**, 1 (1990); J. Polchinski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 397 (1991); H. Scherer and P. Busch, Phys. Rev. **47**, 1647 (1993).

[22] C. G. Shull, D. K. Atwood, J. Arthur, and M. A. Horne, Phys. Rev. Let. **44**, 765 (1980); R. Gahler, A. G. Klein, and A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. **A23**, 1611 (1981); J. J. Bollinger et al., Phys. Rev. Let. **63**, 1031 (1989).

[23] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone and S. Gutman, Ann. Phys. **192**, 368 (1989).

[24] E. T. Jaynes, in "Statistical Physics", Vol. **3**, K. W. Ford, ed., p. 182 (Benjamin, NY 1963) and IEEE Trans. Syst. Sci. Cybern. Vol. **SSC-4**, 227 (1968), both reprinted in [2]; J. E. Shore and R. W. Johnson, IEEE Trans. Inf. Th. Vol. **IT-26**, 26 (1980).

[25] For a similar view see A. Peres, Am. J. Phys. **52**, 644 (1984).

[26] If the states are normalized the points of the array lie on the surface of a unit sphere, but normalization is not necessary for our argument.

[27] When the wave function is non-vanishing over an extended region the particle has no definite position. One may, however, want to refer to situations where the wave function is confined to a sufficiently small region by *saying* that its position is better defined. In the idealized limit of a vanishingly small region one can *say* there is a definite position. This is the case, presumably, with the positions of particles making up the idealized detector itself.

[28] L. P. Hughston, R. Jozsa and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Lett. **A183**, 14 (1993).

[29] See e.g., D. Finkelstein, J. M. Jauch, S. Schiminovich and D. Speiser, J. Math. Phys. **3**, 207 (1962) and **4**, 788 (1963); S. L. Adler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 783 (1985) and Comm. Math. Phys. **104**, 611 (1986); D. Hestenes, "Spacetime Algebra" (Gordon and Breach, 1966), "New Foundations for Classical Mechanics" (Reidel, Dordrecht, 1986); W. E. Baylis (ed.) "Clifford (Geometric) Algebras" (Birkhäuser, Boston, 1996).

[30] C. C. Rodríguez, "Unreal probabilities–partial truth with Clifford numbers", presented at the Eighteenth International Workshop on Maximum Entropy and Bayesian Methods, MaxEnt '98 (July 1998, Garching, Germany) (quant-ph/9808010).